IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOBBY
ORIGINAL SIDE

APPEAL NO.938 OF 2005
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.1787 OF 2005

Harishankar Singh — Appellant
vs.
1. The Secretary
Janseva Samiti & ors. — Respondents

Ms.Raagini Rao i/b.Mr.Mihir Desai for the appellant.

Mr.L.H.Patil for the respondents 1 and 2.

Ms.M.M.Jadhav for the respondents 3 and 5.

**CORAM : R.M. LODHA &**
**S.R. SATHE, JJ.**

**DATED : 9th December 2005**

**P.C.**

Heard Ms.Raagini Rao, the learned counsel for the appellant.

2. The appointment orders dated 13.7.1999, 25.8.2000, 23.8.2001, 28.9.2002 and 7.8.2003 clearly show that the petitioner was appointed purely on temporary basis. Vide appointment letter dated 13.7.1999 the appointment of the petitioner was on clock hour basis. The appointment was for the academic year 1999-2000. Then by appointment letter dated 25.8.2000, the petitioner was appointed for the period from 1.7.2000 to 28.2.2001. Thereafter by the appointment letter dated 23.8.2001, the petitioner was appointed for the period from 20.6.2001 to 28.2.2002. Then by the appointment letter

dated 28.9.2002, the petitioner was appointed from 11.6.2002 to 31.3.2003. By the last appointment letter dated 7.8.2003 the petitioner was appointed for the period from 11.6.2003 to 31.3.2004. In view of the aforestated appointment letters, the contention of the petitioner that he was permanently appointed to the post of lecturer in Economics cannot be accepted. The College Tribunal in its order dated 6.4.2005 held that the petitioner's appointment under the aforesaid appointment orders was on temporary basis and for a limited period and the petitioner had no right to continue in the post after expiry of the said period. We find no fault with the order.

3. The learned Single Judge was also of the view that the order of the College Tribunal does not suffer from any infirmity. There is no justifiable reason to take different view.

4. Appeal has no merit and is dismissed in limine.

**(R. M. LODHA, J.)**

**(S. R. SATHE, J.)**